

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate features of claims 3 and 4 to form a new claim 1. Correspondingly, claims 3 and 4 have been deleted. Claims 5 to 7 originally dependent on the original claim 4 have been amended to depend on the new claim 1. Claims 9 and 10 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 1 and the bent portion of claim 8. Claims 9, 10 and 12 have been corrected to overcome antecedent problems. Claim 8 has been deleted. Claim 11 is retained as originally filed. Additionally, some other antecedent problems in the specification have also been corrected as set in page 2 and following in this response.

The examiner has kindly indicated that claims 4-7 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 9 was not rejected based upon prior art and is assumed to be allowable for the same and similar reasons as set forth for claim 10. After amendment, claims 1, 9 and 10 are allowable, and other claims directly or indirectly dependent thereon are also patentable.

With regard to clearness problems under 35 USC §112, wording in the specification and claims has been amended and briefly remarked as follows:

1. The phrase “combined with” has been amended to “supported by” according to the Examiner’s suggestion in the new claim 1 since the original claim 4 has been combined into the new claim 1.

2. In claims 9 and 10, the term “opening” has been substituted by “inner arc” because each resting member is a bent strip with an inner arc defined at the bend portion near the first end of the resting member according to the figures in the present application. The “inner arc” is more specific than the “opening” to describe the shape and to indicate the orientation of the V-shaped resting member. Additionally, the specification has been correspondingly amended in this matter.

3. In the amended claim 10, description about the resting member has been further added into claim 10 to overcome the antecedent problem of “the bent portion”.

4. Additionally, out of the examiner’s suggestion, “the seat” has been amended to “a seat” to avoid antecedent problem in claim 12 after reviewing the claims through. Other minor problems in claims have been corrected in this response at the same time.

After the combination of original claims to add patentable features in the new claim 1 and amended claims 9 and 10, the rejections under 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103(a) are overcome.

After the amendment to the claims and the specification, the rejection under 35 USC § 112 is overcome. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

King-Yurn Yao

Dated: August 15, 2005.

By 

Alan D. Kamrath

NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.

Attorneys for Applicant

900 Second Avenue South

Suite 820 International Centre

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 392-7306

Facsimile: (612) 349-6556